



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/653,613	08/31/2000	Alan Lasneski	004589.P003	4147

7590

06/27/2002

Donna Jo Coningsby  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP  
7th Floor  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

SHAPIRO, LEONID

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2673

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/653,613

Applicant(s)

LASNESKI, ALAN

Examiner

Leonid Shapiro

Art Unit

2673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 31 August 2000 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: .

• Art Unit: 2673

*Drawings*

1. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

*Specification*

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 13, Line 2 “an image edge circuit 26” is mentioned, Line 17 on the same page refers to “edge detection circuit “. The same name should be used in application.

Appropriate correction is required.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Kuzma US Patent No. 5,574,700).

Kuzma teaches about displaying a digitally converted image:

- with receiving plurality of frames of digitized image data with a plurality of pixel values (See Fig 1-2, items 101-105, 220, 240, in description See Col.5, Lines 13-14)
- capturing at least one reference frame into frame buffer memory, this is selected from plurality of frames based on the pixel values of each

Art Unit: 2673

of the plurality of frames (See Fig. 2, items 210,230,240, in description  
See Col. 5, Lines 45-65)

- transmitting the at least one captured frame to a display device (See  
(See Fig 1-2, items 101-105, 220, 240, in description See Col.5, Lines 58-  
65)

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all  
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuzma as  
aforementioned in claim 1 in view of Manning (US Patent 5,519,790). Kuzma teaches about  
storing a first one of plurality of frames as a first reference frame in a frame buffer memory.

As to claim 2, Kuzma does not show iteratively comparing a subsequent one of the plurality  
of frames to the stored reference frame until the difference between any of the plurality of pixel  
values of the subsequent frame and corresponding plurality of pixel values of the stored  
reference frame exceed a pre-selected threshold value, and storing a next subsequent one of  
plurality of frames as a second reference frame in frame buffer memory. Manning teaches that  
after a key frame is established the next frame is compared to the key frame to determine

Art Unit: 2673

whether the next frame is another key frame. (See Fig. 2a-2c, items 42,50, in description See col.2, Lines 27-32). It would been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use Manning approach in the Kuzma method or apparatus to reduce noise.

As to claims 7, 12 and 15-16, See rejection of claims 1-2.

As to claims 3, 4, 10 and 13, Manning uses pixel values as numerical value for each color of each pixel and the difference between any of the plurality of pixel values is the difference between the numerical values for each color of each of the corresponding pixels of the compared frames (See Fig. 3-5, in description See Col. 2, Lines 26-33).

As to claims 5 and 11, 14, Manning shows that the difference between any of the plurality of pixel values of the compared frames exceeds a pre-selected threshold value when the absolute value of the difference is greater than the pre-selected threshold value (See Fig.2b, item 42, in description See Col.2, Lines 25-32).

As to claims 6 and 9, Manning shows that the color for each pixel includes the color red, green, and blue (See Fig. 1, item 10, 12, 14, 16, in description See Col. 3. Lines 12-14).

### *Conclusion*

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

• Art Unit: 2673

- The Hoang (US Patent No. 6,014,183) reference discloses a method and apparatus for detecting scene changes in a digital video stream.
- The Dopp et al. (US Patent No. 5,606,373) reference discloses a methods for repeated field detection.
- The Ruland (US Patent No. 6,104,831) reference discloses a method for rejection of flickering lights in an imaging system
- The Huang (US Patent No. 5,541,646) reference discloses a display image stabilization apparatus and method of using same.
- The Swan (US Patent No. 6,055,018) reference discloses a system and method for reconstructing noninterlaced captured content for display on a progressive screen.
- The Westerman et al. (US Patent No. 6,157,412) reference discloses a system for identifying video fields generated from film sources.
- Brett (UK Patent Application No. 2 349 031) discloses a method of analyzing a sequence of video frames and signal generation if the value exceeds a predetermined threshold.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonid Shapiro whose telephone number is 703-305-5661. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m. to 5 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on 703-305-4938. The fax phone numbers for the

• Art Unit: 2673

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4750.

Is  
June 20, 2002



BIPIN SHALWALA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600